PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To: ITOH, Tadahiko

32nd Floor, Yebisu Garden Place Tower, 20-3, Ebisu 4-chome, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo 1506032 Japan



PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)

31, 5, 2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference

R04299PCT

International application No.

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

PCT/JP2005/002951

International filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (day/month/year)

17.02.2005

18.02.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC Int.Cl. H03K17/08, G05F1/56, H03K17/687

Applicant

RICOH COMPANY, LTD.

1.	This opinion	contains	indications	relating to	the foll	owing items:
----	--------------	----------	-------------	-------------	----------	--------------

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

Box No. II Priority

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;

citations and explanations supporting such statement

Box No. VI Certain documents cited

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Date of completion of this opinion 12.	05.2005
Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer 5X 3 3 6 3
Japan Patent Office	MIYAJIMA, Ikumi
3-4-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8915	Japan Telephone No. +81-3-3581-1101 Ext. 3596

REST AVAILABLE COPY

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/002951

language in
1
, language earch (under
essary to the
,
reto has been ntical to that
•
7.7

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002951

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

. Statement		·	
Novelty (N)	Claims	3-9	YES
	Claims	1, 2, 10	NO NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	5-8	YES
	Claims	1-4, 9, 10	NO NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-10	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

Document 1: JP 2002-231949 A (NEC Kansai Co., Ltd.) 2002.08.16, column 11, Fig.1

Document 2: JP 2002-100972 A (Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.) 2002.04.05, column 30, Fig.3

Document 3:JP 2000-509933 A (KONINKLUKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.) 2000.08.02, lines 16-26, page 4, Fig.7a

The subject matters of claim 1, 2 and 10 do not meet the requirement of novelty. Document 1 discloses products which are regarded to fall within the definition of "one switching element", "a voltage-generating circuit" and "a control circuit" in the present Claim 1 and 2.

The subject matters of claim 3 and 4 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of the document 1 cited in the ISR and the document 2 cited in the same. The person skilled in the art would easily conceive the idea of applying the technical feature of clamping an input voltage employed in document 2 to the invention disclosed in document 1.

The subject matter of claim 9 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of the document 1 cited in the ISR and the document 3 cited in the same. Document 3 discloses products which are regarded to fall within the definition of "a reference-voltage generating circuit" and "a comparator circuit" in the present Claim 9.

The subject matters of claim 5-8 are neither disclosed in any of the documents cited in the ISR nor obvious to a person skilled in the art.